

**Remarks**

Claims 2, 15 and 17-81 were pending.

Claims 2, 15, 65, 66, and 68-74 were rejected.

Claims 67 and 75-81 were objected to.

Claims 17-64 were allowed.

Claim 15 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 67, 74, 75, 78, and 81 have been amended.

**Claim Rejections -- 35 USC § 102**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2, 15, 65, 66, and 69-74 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Vercaemer et al. (United States Patent Number 6,085,838)(Vercaemer). To the extent the rejection applies to the amended claims, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that rejected claim 2 recites: “injecting a first quantity of a fluidic material into the preexisting structure below the expansion cone; and injecting a second quantity of a fluidic material into the preexisting structure above the expansion cone.” (Emphasis added).

Vercaemer only teaches injecting a first fluid below the die member 28, (Vercaemer, column 6, lines 32-39), and injecting a second fluid below the die member 28. (Vercaemer, column 7, lines 36-46). Applicant respectfully submits that Vercaemer does not teach or suggest: a) the desirability of injecting a fluid above an expansion cone or b) the combination of injecting a fluid above and below an expansion cone.

Applicant respectfully submits that rejected claim 15 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicant respectfully submits that rejected claims 65, 66, and 69-73 are dependent from independent allowable claim 2, discussed above, and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Applicant respectfully submits that rejected claim 74 recites, “wherein decoupling the support member from the tubular member comprises: pressurizing an annular chamber defined above the expansion cone and between the support member and the tubular member.” (Emphasis added).

In contrast, Vercaemer teaches injecting fluids below the die member 28, as discussed above.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claims 2, 15, 65, 66, and 69-74 under 35 USC § 102(e), for at least the reasons discussed above.

### **Claim Rejections -- 35 USC § 103**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 68 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being undependable over Vercaemer in view of Forsyth et al. (United States Patent Number 6,029,748)(Forsyth). To the extent the rejection applies to the amended claim, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that Forsyth does not remedy the defects of Vercaemer discussed above.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that Vercaemer does not teach or suggest the desirability of “lubricating the interface between the annular expansion cone and the tubular member” as recited in claim 68, and that there is no motivation or suggestion in the art to modify Vercaemer as suggested by the Examiner.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claim 68.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

In the Office Action, the Examiner allowed claims 17-64. Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for allowing these claims.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 67 and 75-81 as being dependent upon a rejected based claim. To the extent the objection applies to the amended claims, Applicant respectfully traverses the objection.

Claim 67 has been amended to be an independent claim, and incorporate the subject matter of rejected claim 2.

Claim 75 has been amended to be an independent claim, and incorporate the subject matter of rejected claims 15 and 74.

Claims 76 and 77 now depend from allowable independent claim 75.

Claim 78 has been amended to be an independent claim, and incorporate the subject matter of rejected claim 15.

Claims 79 and 80 now depend from allowable independent claim 78.

Claim 81 has been amended to be an independent claim, and incorporate the subject matter of rejected claim 15.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to claims 67 and 75-81.


**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are drawn to novel subject matter, and patentably distinguishable over the prior art of record. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to reconsider and allow the claims presented for reconsideration herein.

As stated above, to the extent that the present amendment results in additional fees, the Applicant authorizes the Commissioner to charge deposit account no. 08-1394. Unless stated otherwise, none of the amendments to the claims were made for reasons substantially related to the statutory requirements for patentability.

Should the Examiner deem that any further amendment is desirable to place this application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,



Todd Mattingly  
Registration No. 40,298

Date: 5/5/04

HAYNES AND BOONE, L.L.P.  
901 Main Street, Suite 3100  
Houston, Texas 77002-5012  
Telephone: 713-547-2301  
Facsimile: 214-200-0853  
Docket No. 25791.85  
H-479179\_1.DOC

EXPRESS MAIL NO. <u>ET230870313US</u>
DATE OF DEPOSIT: <u>5/5/04</u>
<small>This paper and fee are being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service Express Mail Post Office to Addressee service under 37 CFR §1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.</small>
<u>Stacy Lanier</u>
<small>Name of person mailing paper and fee</small>
<u>Stacy Lanier</u>
<small>Signature of person mailing paper and fee</small>